

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/040,118	01/03/2002	Bruce W. Lee	H0003369 DIV (4960)	1557	
75	590 03/24/2004		EXAM	INER	
Greenberg Tra	aurig		ORTIZ, AN	ORTIZ, ANGELA Y	
2450 Colorado Ave. Santa Monica, CA 90404		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
Santa Womea,	CA 70404		1732		

DATE MAILED: 03/24/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

				M			
		Application No.	Applicant(s)	7			
Office Action Summary		10/040,118	LEE ET AL.				
		Examiner	Art Unit				
		Angela Ortiz	1732				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication or Reply	n appears on the cover sheet v	vith the correspondence address				
THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REMAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIOnsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CF SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication experiod for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, previously prevention of the provided provided the provided provided provided the provided pro	ON. FR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a n. a reply within the statutory minimum of th eriod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MC statute, cause the application to become A	reply be timely filed irty (30) days will be considered timely. NTHS from the mailing date of this communicati BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	ion.			
Status							
1) 🂢	Responsive to communication(s) filed on (03 January 2002.					
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final.							
3)□							
Disposit	ion of Claims						
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-5</u> is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>1</u> is/are rejected. Claim(s) <u>2-5</u> is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	ndrawn from consideration.					
Applicat	ion Papers						
10)⊠	The specification is objected to by the Example The drawing(s) filed on <u>03 January 2002</u> is Applicant may not request that any objection to Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the countries of the oath or declaration is objected to by the	s/are: a) accepted or b) the drawing(s) be held in abeya orrection is required if the drawin	ance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). g(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121				
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12)[a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docum 2. Certified copies of the priority docum 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International Busee the attached detailed Office action for a	ments have been received. ments have been received in priority documents have bee ureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No n received in this National Stage				
2) Notice 3) Information	nt(s) ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948 mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/Sler No(s)/Mail Date 4/8,15, 6/24/02.	8) Paper No	Summary (PTO-413) (s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) 				

Office Action Summary

Application/Control Number: 10/040,118

Art Unit: 1732

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

Claim 5 is objected to because of the following informalities: in line 1, after "holes", the word "of" should be deleted and the word –to-- should be inserted.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim 5 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate of claim 2. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

Applicant is advised that should claim 2 be found allowable, claim 5 will be objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate thereof. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

Application/Control Number: 10/040,118

Art Unit: 1732

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Biunno et al., USP 6,282,782.

The cited reference teaches the claimed method of filling holes in a substrate (300) comprising providing a substrate support fixture (320), readable on the claimed hole-fill stand-off, having a plurality of etched through-holes (340), aligning the substrate (300) to the fixture (320) and placing the substrate (300) in contact with the fixture (320), and aligning the fixture (320) to a backing or support member (344), which is readable on the claimed tooling plate, and filling holes in the substrate (300). See col. 7, lines 45-67; and col. 8, lines 6-7,25-67.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 2-4 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 5 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate of allowable claim 2. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

Art Unit: 1732

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. USP's 4445952; 4884337; 6276055; 6659328.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Angela Ortiz whose telephone number is 571-272-1206. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 9:00-6:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Colaianni can be reached on 571-272-1196. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Angela Ortiz
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1732